REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 27, 2009 to support a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed concurrently. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101; claims 1-6, 14-19, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e); claims 7, 12-13, 20, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant has amended claims 26-27. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Regarding claims 27-30, the Examiner alleges that claim 27 directs a description on a system of grouping that is directed a conceptual description without statutory subject, i.e. a process, machine, manufacture or composition under § 101 (Final Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended claim 27 recites *inter alia* "a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) creator to create a WKG for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users," and "a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) creator to create a SBG within the WKG to allow a user to interact with other mobile users." *Emphasis Added.* (See Specification, par. [031], for further details).

As provided in the specification, "a WKG may be created and/or joined by any device…" and "devices in a WKG create an SBG" (See Specification, par. [0019]-[0020], for further details). As further stated in the specification and illustrated in Figure 1: "Each of the mobile devices 126_1 to 126_L, 136_1 to 136_P, and 140_1 to 140_N typically contains a mobile processor that can execute instructions or programs to perform tasks as described in the following. Each of them may also be equipped by one or multiple WiFi radios or interface cards" (See Specification, par. [020], Figure 1, for further details). *Emphasis Added.* Given that the device is an apparatus which is statutory, the system claims 27-30 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Further, a WKG represents a physical area that corresponds to the radio range of devices (See Specification, par. [018], for further details). Since the devices in a WKG create a SBG (see Specification, par. [019] for further details), the SBG is also a physical area that corresponds

to the radio range of devices that are used to create the SBG. In addition, mobile users represent users or physical entities. Accordingly, a WKG, a SBG, and mobile users are all physical entities, not conceptual or abstract concepts as submitted by the Examiner.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that:

> "Applicant has argued that a WKG represents a physical area that correspond to the radio ranges of devices… the claims are of system nature however without specific reference to any physical means as argued. Thus, Applicant needs to specifically include claim language to include sufficient evidence of physical means" (Final Office Action, page 10, par. a).

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that claims must be read in light of the specification. See MPEP § 2111. The specification states *inter alia* "each of the WKGs 120 and 130 is a physical area that corresponds to the radio range of devices that joined this network" (See Specification, par. [018], for further details).

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification". See MPEP § 2111. Applicant respectfully submits that, contrary to that alleged by the Examiner, an interpretation of the WKGs as being non-physical areas is inconsistent with the specification and thus, improper. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *inter alia* the WKGs are physical areas and no further amendment is required to clarify this aspect of the invention.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner fails to take note and provide response to Applicant's argument that mobile users represent users or physical entities.

Furthermore, "impromptu interactions" represent a transformation that allows users to interact or communicate; "allow a user to interact" represents a transformation that enable a user to communicate with other users; and "advertising information" represents a transformation to broadcast or transmit the information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG. Since all three operations (impromptu interactions, allow a user to interact, and advertising information) represent physical transformations of physical entities (WKG, SBG, mobile users, etc…) or reduction of the group of unrelated mobile users to a different state or thing (e.g. enabling interactions), the claimed invention satisfies the physical transformation requirement. Thus, the claimed invention is statutory.

However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, claim 27 has been amended. Applicant submits that the WKG creator and SBG creator represent physical entities such that the claims tie the elements to a particular machine.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 27-30 are statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101 and respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 14-19, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133689 A1 issued to Vasisht et al. ("Vasisht"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Vasisht discloses method, system and device for automatically configuring a communications network. Improvements in configuring node devices for networking include a Zero Configuration Utility for WiFi that gives users a list of available WiFi networks. If the networks are broadcasting their SSID and do not have encryption, the user can log on to the network by simply accepting a network in the Zero Configuration Utility interface. (Vasisht, par. [0018]). In the case of a network using 802.11 b, at minimum a Service Set Identifier (or SSID) is required on each 802.11 b-equipped router (Vasisht, par. [0013]).

Vasisht does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, at least one of: (1) creating a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) within a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users, the WKG having a WKG network configuration and a set of WKG interaction protocols, the SBG having SBG network configuration and a set of SBG interaction protocols; and (2) advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14, and (3) a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) creator to create a WKG for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users, the WKG having a WKG network configuration and a set of WKG interaction protocols; and (4) a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) creator to create a SBG within the WKG to allow a user to interact with other mobile users, the SBG having SBG network configuration and a set of SBG interaction protocols, the SBG advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG, as recited in amended independent claim 27.

First, <u>Vasisht</u> merely discloses home networks having 802.11b equipped routers with the same default service set identifier (SSID) setting on each device (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0005], lines 1-3; par. [0009], lines 15-17), not for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users. For routers supporting WiFi, the SSID is defaulted to a standard factory default (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0014], lines 10-11). The user still has to acknowledge and enter the same SSID on the node devices (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0016], lines 8-9). Since all the node devices have the same SSID and are connected to the same home network, they are not unrelated mobile users. Furthermore, the interactions of these node devices occur under a configuration or coordination, either through a zero configuration utility (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0018], lines 1-5), or an automatic configuration (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0023], lines 6-7). Accordingly, these interactions are not impromptu interactions. An impromptu interaction is an interaction that occurs in a coincidental way without any pre-coordination. (See, for example, <u>Specification</u>, par. [0014], lines 4-5).

Second, <u>Vasisht</u> merely discloses improvements in configuring node devices for networking (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0018]), not "creating a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) within a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users", as recited in the rejected claims. The improvements include a Zero Configuration Utility for WiFi that gives users a list of available WiFi networks (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0018]). The Examiner alleges a selected WiFi network is the same as "a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) within a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users" (<u>Final Office Action</u>, page 3, par. 3a). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons. The WiFi networks which appear on the list are merely available WiFi networks, which may or may not require authentication or an encryption key, and the user may select one of the networks on the list in order to log his computer onto that selected network (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0018]). In contrast, a SBG is created within the WKG and is typically a group created by users for a specific purpose that is limited in term of lifetime, membership, or applications that it supports. The SBG may be created to avoid the noisy WiFi frequency used by the WKG or to provide a private session for security reasons or to avoid processing data from other devices (See <u>Specification</u>, par. [0024]-[0027], for further details). Since the WiFi network are available networks, they are not created under a specific purpose as a SBG.

Third, <u>Vasisht</u> merely discloses a Service Set Identifier (or SSID) being required on each 802.11 b-equipped router (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0013]), not "advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG", as recited in the claims. As discussed above, the available WiFi networks are not equivalent to the SBG, such that the SSID of a WiFi network cannot be the "information pertaining to the SBG".

Fourth, even if the WiFi networks were equivalent to the SBG, the SSID is not "an access method for joining the restricted SBG", as recited in the claims, because SSID is used only to allow a user to log on "should the network require authentication or an encryption key" (<u>Vasisht</u>, par. [0018]). Logging on is merely to log on to use the WiFi networks, but not to join a group. Moreover, the WiFi networks as disclosed by <u>Vasisht</u> do not have open and restricted groups, therefore, logging on merely allows user to log on a WiFi network, not to join the group which requires a membership to be granted.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges:

> "It seems that applicant is claiming the limitation on a WiFi based system... <u>Vasisht</u> is used to show one skilled in the art of WiFi would recognize that by using SSID a WiFi access to a specific access point is configured; by using WEP a open or restrict access to the access point is further limited. These seem to read upon the limitations where the access to an access point seems to define a workgroup and the further specification of SSID in combination of WEP seems to further limit to a "open" or a "restrict" access to an access point" (<u>Final Office Action</u>, page 11).

Applicant respectfully submits that, even assuming that <u>Vasisht</u> showed that one skilled in the art of WiFi would recognize using SSID to configure WiFi access to a specific access point and using WEP to further limit access to the access point, Vasisht still fails to disclose elements (1)-(4) as above. Additionally, the Examiner still fails to indicate what elements in <u>Vasisht</u> correspond to "a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) within a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG)" and "information pertaining to the SBG," as recited in the claims. Further, as discussed above, the WiFi network in <u>Vasisht</u> cannot correspond to the SBG and the SSID in <u>Vasisht</u> is not information pertaining to the SBG, the information .

In the Response to Arguments Section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner further states:

> "Applicant argued that <u>Vasisht</u> does not advertise information pertaining
> to the SBG on the WKG. Examiner has reviewed applicant's specification on
> SSID. Applicant stated that (paragraph 18) SSID and encryption key are well-
> known WiFi network configurations; (paragraph 33} WEP key is dynamically
> created based upon BSSID; and (paragraph 40) the advertising information
> includes SSID. <u>Vasisht</u> has shown (paragraph 18) that the networks broadcast
> their SSID." (<u>Final Office Action</u>, page 12).

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that both the SSID and the WEP in <u>Vasisht</u>
pertain to the available WiFi networks which cannot correspond to the SBG. Accordingly,
neither the SSID nor the WEP can be the information on the SBG as discussed above.

Additionally, the specification states: "In a WiFi network, the well-known network
configuration may include the SSID and the encryption key"(See <u>Specification</u>, par. [018]) and
"the advertising node 410 collects information on the SBG 310 such as the SSID, the
membership, the interaction protocols used, and the login procedure" (See <u>Specification</u>, par.
[040]). Contrary to that alleged by the Examiner, the SSID cannot be the information on the
SBG because the claims further recite "advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the
WKG, the information including an access method for joining the restricted SBG."

In paragraph [040], the specification provides four examples of information on the SBG
such as "the SSID, the membership, the interaction protocols used, and the login procedure"
(<u>Specification</u>, paragraph [040]). While the SSID is an example of information on the SBG,
<u>Applicant elected to claim "the information including an access method for joining the restricted</u>
<u>SBG</u>." Since the SSID does not include an access method for joining the restricted SBG, the
SSID cannot be the information on the SBG as delineated in the claims.

In the Response to Arguments Section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner further
states:

> "The Examiner further reviewed Applicant's specification on "restrict"
> and found in paragraph 23 "open WKG has not access control, e.g.. does not
> specify any WEP key… WEP seems to be used as an access method for defining
> a restricted or open SBG" (<u>Final Office Action</u>, page 12).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification paragraph 23 recite: "The open WKG
222 has no access control. For example, the WKG does not specify any wireless equivalent
privacy (WEP) key in the WiFi configuration. The restricted WKG 224 has access control to

allow only users selected by the WKG creator. For example, a company may want to restrict its WKG to its devices for digital rights management (DRM) and authentication purposes in order to restrict denial of service attacks (e.g., spam) or the sharing of inappropriate content." (See Specification, par. [023], for further details).

This paragraph does not describe the access method of the SBG but instead, describes the open WKG 222 in contrast to the restricted WKG 224. Additionally, it pertains to the access control and not the access method as delineated in the claims.

Further, the specification states that: "Membership of a restricted session-based group can be fixed at creation time so that no new member can join, may require a registration process to some Internet service in order to obtain the complete WiFi configuration, or may be dynamically granted by current members of the group. It is therefore important for a device to know the access method for joining a restricted SBG. This information is included in the SBG advertisement." (See Specification, par. [031], for further details). *Emphasis Added.*

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the…claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Since the Examiner failed to show that Vasisht teaches or discloses any one of the above elements, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper.

The Examiner bears the burden of presenting at least a *prima facie* case of anticipation. *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 1327, 231 USPQ 136, 138-139 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Wilder*, 429 F.2d 447, 450, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). Only if that burden is met, does the burden of going forward shift to the applicant. *In re King*, 801 F.2d at 1327, 231 USPQ at 138-139; *In re Wilder*, 429 F.2d at 450, 166 USPQ at 548. Once a prima facie case is established and rebuttal evidence is submitted, the ultimate question becomes whether, based on the totality of the record, the Examiner carried his burden of proof by a preponderance. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445. 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). If the Examiner fails to establish a prima facie case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 12-13, 20, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Vasisht</u> and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,284,062 B2 issued to Krantz et al. ("<u>Krantz</u>"), and Feeney et al. (Communications Magazine, IEEE, June 2001, p. 176-181 or p.1-12 per Applicant's disclosed NPL) ("<u>Feeney</u>"); and claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Vasisht</u> and further in view of <u>Feeney</u>. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *MPEP §2143, p. 2100-126 to 2100-130 (8th Ed., Rev. 5, August 2006).* Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine their teachings, and thus no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), stated: "Under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background, the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined." <u>MPEP 2141</u>. In *KSR International Co. vs. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007) (Kennedy, J.), the Court explained that "[o]ften, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order <u>to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at</u>

issue." The Court further required that an explicit analysis for this reason must be made. "[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *KSR 127 S.Ct.* at 1741, quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). In the instant case, Applicant respectfully submits that there are significant differences between the cited references and the claimed invention and there is no apparent reason to combine the known elements in the manner as claimed, and thus no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

Vasisht discloses method, system and device for automatically configuring a communications network as discussed above.

Krantz discloses increasing the level of automation when provisioning a computer system to access a network. Data routing device is a device capable of grouping computer systems together in a single broadcast domain (Krantz, col. 12, lines 27-31).

Feeney discloses spontaneous networking: an application-oriented approach to ad-hoc networking. An ad hoc network provides administrative services and supports functionalities including address allocation, name resolution, service location, authentication, and access control policies (Feeney, Abstract).

Vasisht, Krantz, and Feeney, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or render obvious (1) creating a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) within a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users, the WKG having a WKG network configuration and a set of WKG interaction protocols, the SBG having SBG network configuration and a set of SBG interaction protocols; and (2) advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14, and (3) a well-known ad-hoc group (WKG) creator to create a WKG for impromptu interactions among unrelated mobile users, the WKG having a WKG network configuration and a set of WKG interaction protocols; and (4) a session-based ad-hoc group (SBG) creator to create a SBG within the WKG to allow a user to interact with other mobile users, the SBG having SBG network configuration and a set of SBG interaction protocols, the SBG advertising information pertaining to the SBG on the WKG, as recited in amended independent claim 27; and (5) selecting an advertising node according to a criteria within the SBG; (6) collecting information on the SBG; (7) periodically joining the WKG

to broadcast the SBG information and to collect information on the WKG or a nearby SBG; and (8) returning to the SBG to advertise the information collected on the WKG to SBG members, as recited in claims 7 and 20.

As discussed above, Vasisht does not disclose or render obvious elements (1)-(4) as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 27. Accordingly, a combination of Vasisht with any other references in rejecting claims dependent thereon is improper.

Furthermore, Krantz merely discloses a data routing device being a device capable of grouping computer systems together in a single broadcast domain (Krantz, col. 12, lines 27-31) and Feeney merely discloses an ad hoc network providing administrative services and supporting functionalities including address allocation, name resolution, service location, authentication, and access control policies (Feeney, Abstract).

The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Vasisht's functions of using WEP/802.11 in configuring a user network with limit access with Feeney's functions of establishing ad hoc network without pre-established or central network management and Krantz's functions of using a data routing device to group computer systems. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 7 and 20 recite "selecting an advertising node according to a criteria within the SBG; collecting information on the SBG; periodically joining the WKG to broadcast the SBG information and to collect information on the WKG or a nearby SBG; and returning to the SBG to advertise the information collected on the WKG to SBG members".

As provided above, the WiFi networks in Vasisht are not the same as SBG. In addition, none of the functionalities including address allocation, name resolution, service location, authentication, and access control policies, as provided in Feeney, involve at least "collecting information on the WKG… and advertise the information collected on the WKG to SBG members" as recited in the claims. Furthermore, Krantz merely discloses a data routing device which does not disclose either a WKG or a SBG, let alone any of the elements as delineated in claims 7 and 20.

Applicant respectfully submits that for the Examiner to conclude that the elements as recited in claims 7 and 20 are disclosed by a combination of Vasisht's list of available WiFi networks which may require a WEP key to log on, Feeney's list of functionalities such as

address allocation to be supported by an ad hoc network, and <u>Krantz</u>'s teaching of a mere router, is a leap of logic.

The Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and failed to show there is teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. When applying 35 U.S.C. 103, the following tenets of patent law must be adhered to: (A) The claimed invention must be considered as a whole; (B) The references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination; (C) The references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention; and (D) Reasonable expectation of success is the standard with which obviousness is determined. *Hodosh v. Block Drug Col, Inc.,* 786 F.2d 1136, 1143 n.5, 229 USPQ 182, 187 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1986). "When determining the patentability of a claimed invention which combined two known elements, 'the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination.'" *In re Beattie*, 974 F.2d 1309, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 1992), 24 USPQ2d 1040; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.,* 730 F.2d 1452, 1462, 221 USPQ (BNA) 481, 488 (Fed. Cir. 1984). To defeat patentability based on obviousness, the suggestion to make the new product having the claimed characteristics must come from the prior art, not from the hindsight knowledge of the invention. *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 744 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ (BNA) 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985). To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the Examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness. In other words, the Examiner must show reasons that a skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the prior elements from the cited prior references for combination in the manner claimed. *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1996), 47 USPQ 2d (BNA) 1453. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or implicitly suggest the claimed invention or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973. (Bd.Pat.App.&Inter. 1985). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious

unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so." *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992), 23 USPQ2d 1780.

Moreover, the Examiner failed to establish the factual inquires in the three-pronged test as required by the *Graham* factual inquires. There are significant differences between the cited references and the claimed invention as discussed above. Furthermore, the Examiner has not made an explicit analysis on the apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion in the claimed invention. Accordingly, there is no apparent reason to combine the teachings of Vasisht, Krantz, and Feeney in any combination.

In the present invention, the cited references do not expressly or implicitly disclose any of the above elements. In addition, the Examiner failed to present a convincing line of reasoning as to why a combination of Vasisht, Krantz, and Feeney is an obvious application of "discovering nearby hosts and applications for impromptu interactions using well-known ad-hoc network configuration", or an explicit analysis on the apparent reason to combine Vasisht, Krantz, and Feeney in the manner as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 21, 2009   By / THINH V. NGUYEN /
                                 Thinh V. Nguyen
                                 Reg. No. 42,034
                                 Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025